

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 5-9 are pending in the application. Claims 2-4 are canceled. Claims 1 and 5-9 are amended.

The Office Action indicates that the title of the invention is not descriptive and requires a new title. Applicants have amended the title to obviate this objection.

The Office Action objected to claim 9 because of a typing error. The term "leves" has been corrected to read as "levels", thus obviating this objection.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 2-3 and 5-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant incorporated features recited in original claim 2 into independent claim 1. Applicant also incorporated features recited in original claim 4 into now independent claim 5. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 5 are now allowable independent claims.

Claims 6-8, which are dependent on independent claim 5, were amended to improve claim language and clarify features recited in claims 6 and 8. Because claim 5 is now allowable, dependent claims 6-8 are also allowable.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claim 9. Applicants also note that claim 9 was objected to as described above. Applicant has amended claim 9 to obviate the objection described above and to correct formatting. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,612,733 by Flohr, hereinafter referred to as "Flohr". Applicants amended claim 1 to include recitals that were previously presented in original claim 2, now canceled. Flohr does not disclose "a system for sensing object proximity to an active source of

lighting,” and further does not disclose “controlling said display and said camera, wherein said computer synchronizes an operation of said display and said camera, and wherein said camera captures images of said at least one object corresponding to different levels of said brightness of said display”, as is recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Flohr does not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and request that the 102(b) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flohr in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,875 by Hashimoto et al. Applicant canceled claim 4 and amended claim 5 to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 4, thus placing claim 5 in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants submit that the 103(a) rejection of claim 4 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-6-04



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicant  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401